

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/767,539	01/23/2001	Steven Adler-Golden	SPSC/001/US	2985
Brian M. Dingr	7590 07/02/200 nan	EXAMINER		
Mirick, O'Conn	ell, DeMallie & Louge	GUTIERREZ, ANTHONY		
100 Front Street Worcester, MA 01608-1477			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	09/767,539	ADLER-GOLDEN ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Anthony Gutierrez	2857		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	I.  lely filed  the mailing date of this communication.  D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 Ag     This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This     Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4)  Claim(s) 1-7 and 36 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 36 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) 1-7 is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 11 August 2003 is/are:  Applicant may not request that any objection to the objected to by the Carrection  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner  Property of the Examiner  Prop	a) $\square$ accepted or b) $\boxtimes$ objected the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See non is required if the drawing(s) is object.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.				
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite		

Application/Control Number: 09/767,539 Page 2

Art Unit: 2857

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection.

Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/11/07 has been entered.

# **Drawings**

2. The drawings filed 8/11/03 are objected to because they have been determined to be informal. Appropriate correction is required.

### Claim Objections

- 3. Claim1 is objected to because of the following informalities:
  - It is an improper Jepson claim. The phrase "improved" needs to be deleted or the phrase "wherein the improvement comprises" needs to be added. See M.P.E.P. 2129 (III) and 37 CFR 1.75 (e).
  - "a number of images" is unclear as to how many (i.e., 1, 2, 3, 0). It should be changed to "a plurality of images" or "at least one image" depending on the intended scope.

 The claim includes the limitation "the calculated radiation transport model parameters" in line 13. There is insufficient antecedent basis in the claims.

Claims 2-7 and 36 are likewise objected to for the reasons indicated above with respect to claim 1.

Appropriate correction is required.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claim includes the amended limitation in which trial visibility values are provided for a plurality of trail aerosol values **and/**or a plurality or aerosol types.

Providing the visibility values for a plurality of aerosol values **and** a plurality of aerosol types is not described in the original disclosure.

Art Unit: 2857

# Allowable Subject Matter

- 6. Claims 1-7 are objected to but would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the objections indicated above.
- 7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The Examiner considers the closest art of record to be the paper to Adler-Golden et al. (1999). Applicant has amended the claims such that the image pixels have predefined ratios but unknown reflectances. As such, the interpretation of the art on which the Examiner has relied is no longer a fair interpretation as the Examiner is persuaded by Applicant arguments that the calibration panels cited by the Examiner to address the selected pixels are taught to be reference pixels which are taught to have known reflectances. Thus the Examiner agrees that the calibration panels do not provide ratios of reflectances (the ratios being taught to be used when the reflectances are unknown) and thus the ratios cannot be used in the claimed comparison or for resolving a corrected image visibility value.

The Examiner therefore maintains that Applicant's claimed invention is deemed allowable over the prior art as the prior art fails to teach or fairly suggest correcting for atmospheric effects on a remote image of the Earth's surface taken from above, wherein the image comprises a number of images of the same scene each including a large number of pixels, each at a different wavelength band, and including infrared through visible wavelengths, comprising: selecting image pixels having unknown reflectances but having one

Art Unit: 2857

or more presumed, predefined ratios of reflectances among two or more specific wavelength bands, using calculated radiation transport model parameters to determine the surface reflectance for the selected image pixels for each of the specific wavelength bands for each combination of trial visibility value and trial aerosol property value or values, or aerosol type; comparing the determined surface reflectances to the predefined ratio of reflectances; and resolving from the comparison a corrected image visibility value for each trial aerosol property value or values or aerosol type.

#### Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Gutierrez whose telephone number is (571) 272-2215. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eliseo Ramos-Feliciano can be reached on (571) 272-7925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2857

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AĠ nthony

Anthony Gutierrez Art Unit 2857 6/25/07

> ELISEO RAMOS-FELICIANO SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER